

## RECREATION

The affected environment contains much information that is not used in the impacts analysis.

Some of the information is potentially useful and much of it is not relevant. Comments refer to general ways of focusing the report. More specific comments are not justified until the report is modified. The impacts analysis is better organized, but not very specific. It should make more reference to the pertinent information developed for comparison in the affected environment report. The report needs greater specificity, perhaps by reducing the information in the affected environment report to that which lends itself to comparison against the alternatives. Mitigation measures should be identified. Construction impacts should be identified.

# Conformance to Outline

## Recreation

### Affected Environment

- No TOC
- Summary not prepared
- Does not conform to the outline in many respects:
- Heading numbering is internally inconsistent and inconsistent with the outline.
- Section 3 is called Study Period. This could be made part of the introduction
- There is no regulatory context section (should be Section 4.2)
- No section on information common to all regions (optional).

### Environmental Consequences

- No TOC
- Executive summary includes reference to Table 1 but does not describe impacts
- Section 5.0: heading 5.1 "Impact Analysis" is not needed. "No Action" should begin at Section 5.1. Similarly, "Impacts of Alternatives" should begin at heading 5.2. Otherwise conforms to outline.
- .

**REVIEW COMMENTS**  
**CALFED BAY-DELTA PROGRAM PEIS TECHNICAL REPORTS**  
**RECREATION**

***AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT***

<b>No.</b>	<b>Page/Para</b>	<b>Comment</b>
1	general	Current resource conditions refer to the existing conditions baseline. If data are unavailable for baseline conditions, some recognition should be presented in the text of the relation of the relevance of the data to the baseline timeframe.
2	general	The historical perspective should be brief. The focus should be on existing conditions. Tables of historical data are generally irrelevant, or their relevance should be explicitly described. Graphs showing time series trends in historical data values (e.g., increased user-days between 1945 to 1995) would be useful for showing where we are on the continuum. Given that the focus is on existing conditions, the data presented to describe existing conditions should be consistent with the impacts analysis. Tables of visitor-days in various regions for various activities could be compared to corresponding values predicted under each of the alternatives to arrive at an assessment of the magnitude of the impacts. Only the kinds of information that further the impact analysis should be presented. For example, can angler effort (Table 3) be compared to future angler effort? If not, there may be no reason to present the information. The reader may lose track of the forest for the trees.
3	General organization	There are 19 pages of text with many levels of subheadings. The information is organized by region, then issue area. None of the discussions is very long, but the number of topics multiplied by each of the five regions makes for a very long, choppy section.
4	General, completeness	The individual discussions of issues for each region are generally good and focused without a lot of extraneous discussion. Writing seems adequate, but at this stage has lots of typos and needs to be proofread.
5	General, level of detail	There is enough information that the section could function well as an appendix. There is a series of detailed tables at the end of the report that would need no modification to serve in the appendix.
6	General, organization	Overall, the Setting has enough relevant material for a programmatic level EIR/EIS section, but will need substantial editing to make it more concise and useable. It should be edited to have the first level of headings be the issue topics with each region discussed briefly under the issue, as applicable. (Note: this suggestion might not work if there are overarching requirements that issues/impacts be described by region.)
7	General, data gaps	Several data gaps are identified in the Setting section regarding the history of salmon sport fishing success and historical information on recreation at some west slope Sierra Nevada rivers, but they do not appear to be large or especially important omissions.
10	Sections 4.4-4.8	Consider deleting subheadings below the level of "Historical Perspective" and "Current Resource Conditions" because they tend to break up the flow of the text.
11	References	Consider not including secondary references that are not cited in the

9/30/97

1

**C - 0 0 4 2 5 3**

C-004253

**REVIEW COMMENTS**  
**CALFED BAY-DELTA PROGRAM PEIS TECHNICAL REPORTS**  
**RECREATION**

		text but were supplied in the CVPIA PEIS. Is the same information available elsewhere?
--	--	--

9/30/97

2

C - 0 0 4 2 5 4

C-004254

**REVIEW COMMENTS**  
**CALFED BAY-DELTA PROGRAM PEIS TECHNICAL REPORTS**  
**RECREATION**

***ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS/ CONSEQUENCES***

<b>No.</b>	<b>Page/Para</b>	<b>Comment</b>
1	Exec Summary	The Exec. Summary references Table 1 but does not describe impacts. It should be a summary of all information presented in the report. Follow the report organization in the Exec. Summary.
2	General, completeness	There are numerous information gaps and analysis gaps. The recurring heading "Summary of Regional Effects by Alternative" has no text. This would seem to be the material most suited to use as the EIR/EIS impact discussion, but it has not been developed yet.
3	Significance	Significance criteria is adequate for programmatic analysis.
4	General, organization	Headings are very confusing because the format is the same for all heading levels – only the three-place numbering system differentiates the levels. With so many subsections, a better header layout is essential. Overall layout is not user friendly.
5	General,	Numerous typos – needs to be proofed.
6	General, level of detail	Analysis is generally adequate for a programmatic level, but is extremely brief for many issues and at a very general level of detail. There are no specific impacts identified – only relatively general discussions. Some discussions are so general as to be meaningless, e.g., "impacts could result from reservoir drawdown; the extent and type of impacts would depend on the extent of drawdown." Impact discussions need more specificity (while still remaining at a programmatic level of detail) with more descriptive titles.
7	General, mitigations	There are no mitigations identified. Only mention of mitigation is two brief statements regarding mitigation strategies in the beginning of the section.
8	General, adequacy for PEIS	Overall, this section will need a lot of editing to make it usable as an EIR/EIS section. The core of the analysis is there, but holes need to be filled in and much of the section needs to be summarized.
9	3.0 Assessment Methods	This section should describe the methods that were used. Do not use future tense.
10	4.0 Significance Criteria	Focus on significance criteria. Choose fewer criteria, that apply to a wider range of impacts. For example, use reduction in use-days as a general criterion and select a percentage value as the significance threshold, with ranges of less than significant values to illustrate the differences in alternatives. Focus impacts on recreation variables rather than flows, vegetation, etc.
11	5.1.1	No Action impacts are described too qualitatively.
12	5.1.2, general	It is not sufficient to state that the alternative may have an impact (see para 2 under "Water Use Efficiency, page 5). Identify the impacts, its magnitude, and the corresponding mitigation measure if the impact is significant. This applies throughout.

9/30/97

3

**C - 0 0 4 2 5 5**

C-004255